

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-10, 13-21, 23-29, and 31-48 are pending, of which claims 1-5, 9-10, 15, 17, 24, 27, 32, 38-40, 42-44, and 46 have been amended.

35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections

A. Claims 1, 3, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. JP04013288A to Aoyama (hereinafter "Aoyama") (*Office Action* p.2).

B. Claims 9-14, 43-46, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0193895 to Qian et al. (hereinafter "Qian") (*Office Action* p.3 and p.10).

C. Claims 15-17, 19, 23-28, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,649,234 to Klappert et al. (hereinafter "Klappert") (*Office Action* p.5).

D. Claims 32, 33, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,654,516 to Tashiro et al. (hereinafter "Tashiro") (*Office Action* p.7).

E. Claims 38, 39, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,194,682 to Okamura et al. (hereinafter "Okamura") (*Office Action* p.9).

1 **Claim 1** recites a method comprising:

2 receiving a request to play an audio file;
3 identifying a preferred language for displaying a lyric set associated
4 with the audio file;
5 searching a list of lyrics sets associated with the audio file and
6 arranged in a priority order according to language, to determine whether the
7 lyric set is available in the preferred language;
8 identifying an alternate lyric set to be displayed based on the priority
9 order when the lyric set is not available in the preferred language; and
10 playing the audio file and displaying the alternate lyric set.

11 Aoyama does not show or disclose each of the elements recited in claim 1,
12 such as “searching a list of lyric sets associated with the audio file and arranged in
13 a priority order according to language to determine whether the lyric set is
14 available in the preferred language”, “identifying an alternate lyric set to be
15 displayed based on the priority order when the lyric set is not available in the
16 preferred language”, and “playing the audio file and displaying the alternate lyric
17 set.”

18 The Office cites to Aoyama which describes a Karaoke device in which the
19 lyrics are available in more than one language, and a switch which can be used by
20 a Karaoke singer to select a language from the available languages (*Office Action*
21 pp. 2-3; *Aoyama* Abstract and Fig. 1). Although, a Karaoke singer may use the
22 switch to make a selection of one of the available languages for displaying lyrics,
23 Aoyama says nothing about searching a list of lyric sets which are arranged in a
24 priority order according to language, or identifying an alternate lyric set to be
25 displayed based on the priority order when the lyric set is not available in the
 preferred language, as recited in claim 1.

1 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Aoyama for at least these reasons
2 and Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

3
4 **Claims 3, 7, and 8** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
5 claim 1. Additionally, some or all of claims 3, 7, and 8 may be allowable over
6 Aoyama for independent reasons.

7
8 **Claim 9** recites a method comprising:

9
10 receiving a request to play an audio file;
11 identifying a plurality of lyric segments associated with the audio
12 file, wherein each lyric segment has an associated time code, and wherein
13 each time code identifies a time during playback of the audio file that a
14 corresponding lyric segment is displayed;
15 playing the audio file and displaying a first lyric segment;
16 receiving a request to jump to a different part of the audio file;
17 playing the different part of the audio file; and
18 displaying the first lyric segment until a time during playback of the
19 audio file matches a time code in the different part of the audio file, and
20 then displaying a different lyric segment associated with the time code in
21 the different part of the audio file.

22
23 Qian does not show or disclose each of the elements recited in claim 9,
24 such as “playing the audio file and displaying a first lyric segment; receiving a
25 request to jump to a different part of the audio file; playing the different part of the
audio file; and displaying the first lyric segment until a time during playback of
the audio file matches a time code in the different part of the audio file, and then
displaying a different lyric segment associated with the time code in the different
part of the audio file.”

1 The Office indicates that Qian discloses a graphical user interface via which
2 a user can select various points in the song, and then play the audio file from the
3 chosen location along with the corresponding lyrics (*Office Action* p. 5;
4 *Qian* Fig. 11). Although Qian may generally describe jumping to a different point
5 in the song, Qian says nothing about handling a jump request as described in claim
6 9. For example, Qian does not show or disclose displaying the first lyric segment
7 until a time during playback of the audio file matches a time code in the different
8 part of the audio file, and then displaying a different lyric segment associated with
9 the time code in the different part of the audio file, as recited in claim 9.

10 Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable over Qian for at least these reasons and
11 Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

12
13 **Claims 10-14** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 9.
14 Additionally, some or all of claims 10-14 may be allowable over Qian for
15 independent reasons.

16
17 **Claim 15** recites a method comprising:

18 selecting an audio file to edit;
19 identifying lyric segments associated with the audio file;
20 associating a language and a sublanguage with the lyric segments,
the sublanguage identifying a country/region dialect of the language;
21 assigning a time code to each lyric segment, wherein each time code
identifies a temporal location within the audio file; and
22 saving the time codes and the corresponding lyric segments.

1 Klappert does not show or disclose each of the elements recited in claim 15,
2 such as “associating a language and a sublanguage with the lyric segments, the
3 sublanguage identifying a country/region dialect of the language”. For reference,
4 “language” is described in the specification as being a basic language (such as
5 “English”, “French”, or “German”) and a “sublanguage” as being a country/region
6 dialect subcategory of the language. For example, sublanguages of “English” are
7 “United Kingdom” and “United States” (*Specification* p.15). In other words, a
8 sublanguage is a regional dialect of a basic language distinguished by features
9 such as vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation.

10 Klappert says nothing about associating a language and a sublanguage with
11 the lyric segments, as recited in claim 15. Instead, Klappert only describes
12 producing graphical clues to words being displayed to a Karaoke singer so that the
13 Karaoke singer can follow the words as the music is played (*Klappert Abstract*).

14 Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable over Klappert for at least these reasons
15 and Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

16
17 **Claims 16, 17, 19, and 23** are allowable by virtue of their dependency
18 upon claim 15. Additionally, some or all of claims 16, 17, 19, and 23 may be
19 allowable over Klappert for independent reasons.
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 **Claim 24** recites a method comprising:

2 selecting an audio file to edit;
3 identifying static lyrics associated with the audio file;
4 associating a language and a sublanguage with the static lyrics, the
5 sublanguage identifying a country/region dialect of the language;
6 separating the static lyrics into a plurality of lyric segments;
7 assigning a time code to each of the plurality of lyric segments,
8 wherein each time code identifies a temporal location within the audio file;
9 and
10 saving the time codes and the corresponding lyric segments.

11 Klappert does not show or disclose each of the elements recited in claim 24,
12 such as “associating a language and a sublanguage with the static lyrics, the
13 sublanguage identifying a country/region dialect of the language”. As described
14 above in response to the rejection of claim 15, Klappert says nothing about
15 associating a language and a sublanguage with the lyric segments, but instead only
16 describes producing graphical clues to words being displayed to a Karaoke singer
17 so that the Karaoke singer can follow the words.

18 Accordingly, claim 24 is allowable over Klappert for at least these reasons
19 and Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

20 **Claims 25-28 and 31** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
21 claim 24. Additionally, some or all of claims 25-28 and 31 may be allowable over
22 Klappert for independent reasons.
23
24
25

1 **Claim 32** recites a method comprising:

2 receiving a request to play an audio file;
3 identifying a preferred language for displaying lyrics;
4 identifying an alternate language for displaying lyrics;
5 playing the audio file and displaying associated lyric data in the
6 preferred language if lyric data is available in the preferred language; and
7 playing the audio file and displaying associated lyric data in the
8 alternate language if lyric data is not available in the preferred language.

9 Tashiro does not show or disclose each of the elements recited in claim 32,
10 such as “playing the audio file and displaying associated lyric data in the preferred
11 language if lyric data is available in the preferred language” and “playing the
12 audio file and displaying associated lyric data in the alternate language if lyric data
13 is not available in the preferred language.”

14 Tashiro describes the possibility of having multiple sets of data tracks
15 which correspond to multiple languages, and describes that the Japanese language
16 version and the foreign language version of the same song can be indicated by
17 different codes so that a user can simply designate the appropriate code to select
18 the desired version (*Office Action* p. 8; *Tashiro* Figs. 5a & 7 and col.10 ln.65 to
19 col.11 ln.2). In other words, Tashiro simply describes selecting a language from
20 among the available language choices. Tashiro does not show or disclose playing
21 the audio file and displaying associated lyric data in an alternate language if lyric
22 data is not available in the preferred language, as recited in claim 32.

23 Accordingly, claim 32 is allowable over Tashiro for at least these reasons
24 and Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.
25

1 Claims 33 and 35-37 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
2 claim 32. Additionally, some or all of claims 33 and 35-37 may be allowable over
3 Tashiro for independent reasons.

4
5 Claim 38 recites an apparatus comprising:

6 an audio player to play an audio file; and
7 a language selection module to search a list of lyrics sets associated
8 with the audio file and arranged in a priority order according to language, to
9 determine whether a lyric set is available in a preferred language, and to
10 identify an alternate lyric set to be displayed based on the priority order
11 when the lyric set is not available in the preferred language; and
12 a lyric display module coupled to the audio player and the language
13 selection module, the lyric display module to identify the alternate lyric set
14 associated with the audio file, wherein the lyric display module displays the
15 identified alternate lyric set synchronously with playing of the audio file.

16
17 Okamura does not show or disclose each of the elements recited in
18 claim 38, such as “a language selection module to search a list of lyrics sets
19 associated with the audio file and arranged in a priority order according to
20 language, to determine whether a lyric set is available in a preferred language, and
21 to identify an alternate lyric set to be displayed based on the priority order when
22 the lyric set is not available in the preferred language” and “a lyric display module
23 coupled to the audio player and the language selection module, the lyric display
24 module to identify the alternate lyric set associated with the audio file, wherein the
25 lyric display module displays the identified alternate lyric set synchronously with
playing of the audio file.”

 The Office cites to Okamura which describes a musical accompaniment
playing apparatus which displays lyrics for a Karaoke singer, and then mixes voice

1 information (from the singer's voice) with musical accompaniment information
2 (*Office Action* pp. 9-10; Okamura Abstract and col.14 lns.63-70). Okamura
3 describes that one lyric set (corresponding to one language) is ordinarily
4 displayed, but if additional lyric sets are available, a singer can select another lyric
5 set using the operation unit 15 (*Okamura* col.14 lns.63-70 and Fig. 2B).

6 Although the Karaoke singer may use the operation unit 15 (*Okamura*
7 Fig. 2B) to select one of the available lyric sets, Okamura says nothing about a
8 language selection module to search a list of lyric sets associated with the audio
9 file and arranged in a priority order according to language to determine whether a
10 lyric set is available in a preferred language, and to identify an alternate lyric set to
11 be displayed based on the priority order when the lyric set is not available in the
12 preferred language, as recited in claim 38. In Okamura, any identification of an
13 alternate lyric set is simply made by the Karaoke singer. Such identification is not
14 done by a language selection module which identifies the alternate lyric set based
15 on the priority order, as recited in claim 38.

16 Accordingly, claim 38 is allowable over Okamura for at least these reasons
17 and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

18
19 **Claims 39, 41, and 42** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
20 claim 38. Additionally, one or both of claims 39 and 42 may be allowable over
21 Okamura for independent reasons.

1 **Claim 43** recites an apparatus comprising:

2 means for identifying an audio file to play;

3 means for identifying a plurality of lyric segments associated with
4 the audio file, wherein each lyric segment has an associated time code, and
5 wherein the time codes identify periods of time during playback of the
6 audio file;

7 means for identifying a preferred language and a preferred
8 sublanguage for displaying lyrics, wherein the preferred sublanguage
9 identifies a country/region dialect of the preferred language; and

10 means for playing the audio file and displaying a lyric segment that
11 corresponds to the current time code.

12 Qian does not show or disclose each of the elements recited in claim 43,
13 such as a “means for identifying a preferred language and a preferred sublanguage
14 for displaying lyrics, wherein the preferred sublanguage identifies a country/region
15 dialect of the preferred language”.

16 Qian describes an encoder for synchronizing multimedia files into an audio
17 bit stream (*Qian* Title and Abstract). Regarding languages, Qian describes that
18 when using the encoder for synchronizing multimedia files into an audio bit
19 stream, the project properties which can be set include setting the language (*Office*
20 *Action* p. 11; *Qian* paragraph 72 and Fig. 8b). However, Qian says nothing about
21 a means for identifying a preferred language and a preferred sublanguage for
22 displaying lyrics, wherein the preferred sublanguage identifies a country/region
23 dialect of the preferred language, as recited in claim 43.

24 Accordingly, claim 43 is allowable over Qian for at least these reasons and
25 Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

1 **Claims 44 and 45** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
2 claim 43. Additionally, one or both of claims 44 and 45 may be allowable over
3 Qian for independent reasons.

4
5 **Claim 46** recites one or more computer-readable media having stored
6 thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors,
7 causes the one or more processors to:

8 receive a request to play an audio file;
9 identify a preferred language and a preferred sublanguage that
10 identifies a country/region dialect of the preferred language in which to
 display lyrics associated with the audio file;
11 identify a plurality of lyric segments associated with the audio file,
 wherein each lyric segment is associated with the preferred sublanguage
12 and each lyric segment has an associated time code, and wherein each time
 code identifies a time during playback of the audio file that a corresponding
13 lyric segment is displayed; and
14 play the audio file and display the appropriate lyric segments as the
 audio file is played.

15
16 Qian does not show or disclose each of the elements recited in claim 46.
17 For example, Qian does not show or disclose to “identify a preferred language and
18 a preferred sublanguage that identifies a country/region dialect of the preferred
19 language in which to display lyrics associated with the audio file”.

20 Qian describes an encoder for synchronizing multimedia files into an audio
21 bit stream (*Qian* Title and Abstract). Regarding languages, Qian describes that
22 when using the encoder for synchronizing multimedia files into an audio bit
23 stream, the project properties which can be set include setting the language.
24 (*Office Action* p. 11; *Qian* paragraph 72 and Fig. 8b). Qian says nothing about
25 identifying a preferred language and a preferred sublanguage that identifies a

1 country/region dialect of the preferred language in which to display lyrics
2 associated with the audio file, as recited in claim 43.

3 Qian also does not show or disclose to “identify a plurality of lyric
4 segments associated with the audio file, wherein each lyric segment is associated
5 with the preferred sublanguage” as recited in claim 46.

6 Accordingly, claim 46 is allowable over Qian for at least these reasons and
7 Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

8
9 **Claim 48** is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon claim 46.
10 Additionally, claim 46 may be allowable over Qian for independent reasons.

11
12 **35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

13 **A.** Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over
14 Aoyama in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0173968 to Parry
15 (hereinafter “Parry”) (*Office Action* p.12).

16 **B.** Claim 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over
17 Aoyama in view of Tashiro (*Office Action* p.12).

18 **C.** Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over
19 Klappert in view of Parry (*Office Action* p.14).

20 **D.** Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over
21 Klappert in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0100965 to Sitrick et al.
22 (hereinafter “Sitrick”) (*Office Action* p.14).

23 **E.** Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for
24 obviousness over Klappert in view of Aoyama (*Office Action* p.15).
25

1 F. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for
2 obviousness over Klappert in view of Qian (*Office Action* p.15).

3 G. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over
4 Tashiro in view of Parry (*Office Action* p.16).

5 H. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over
6 Okamura in view of Parry (*Office Action* p.16).

7 I. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over
8 Okamura in view of Tashiro (*Office Action* p.16).

9 J. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over
10 Qian in view of Okamura (*Office Action* p.17).

11
12 Each of the claims rejected under §103 are dependent claims that ultimately
13 depend from one of the independent claims 1, 9, 15, 24, 32, 38, 43, or 46. It is
14 axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim
15 is also allowable, and therefore the dependent claims rejected under §103 should
16 be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above in response to the §102
17 rejections of the independent claims, as well as for their own recited features
18 which are neither shown nor supported by the cited art. Further, Parry, Tashiro,
19 Sitrick, Qian, and/or Okamura do not cure the deficiencies described above with
20 respect to the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections of the independent claims 1, 9, 15, 24, 32,
21 38, 43, and 46.

22 Additionally, none of the independent claims 1, 9, 15, 24, 32, 38, 43, and
23 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 for obviousness, and are therefore
24 nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103. As stated in section 2143.03 of the MPEP,
25

1 "[i]f an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim
2 depending therefrom is nonobvious."

3 In accordance with the above referenced tenet and preceding discussion, all
4 of the claims that depend ultimately from one of the independent claims 1, 9, 15,
5 24, 32, 38, 43, or 46 are also nonobvious. Specifically, claims 2-8 depend from
6 claim 1, claims 10-14 depend from claim 9, claims 16-23 depend from claim 15,
7 claims 25-31 depend from claim 24, claims 33-37 depend from claim 32, claims
8 39-42 depend from claim 38, claims 44-45 depend from claim 43, and claims 47-
9 48 depend from claim 46 and are also nonobvious for the reasons stated above.

10 Accordingly, the §103 rejections be withdrawn, and Applicant requests that
11 each of the dependent claims be allowed in the next Action.

12
13 **Conclusion**

14 Pending claims 1-10, 13-21, 23-29, and 31-48 are in condition for
15 allowance and Applicant requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject
16 application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the
17 Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent
18 Action.

19 Respectfully Submitted,

20
21 Dated: June 26, 2006

22 By: Christen M. Fairborn

23 Christen M. Fairborn
24 Lee & Hayes, PLLC
25 Reg. No. 55,164
(509) 324-9256 x 262